



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/665,203	09/18/2003	Rong Wen	MACUS.002A	5747
20995 7590 04/03/2008 KNOBBE MARTENS OLSON & BEAR LLP 2040 MAIN STREET FOURTEENTH FLOOR IRVINE, CA 92614				
EXAMINER				
FAY, ZOHREH A				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
1612				
NOTIFICATION DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
04/03/2008		ELECTRONIC		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

jcartee@kmob.com  
eOAPilot@kmob.com

### Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

10/665,203

**Applicant(s)**

WEN ET AL.

**Examiner**

ZOHREH A. FAY

**Art Unit**

1612

**Period for Reply** -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 July 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 30-134 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 75-134 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 30-74 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/CDC)
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_

Art Unit: 1612

Claims 30-134 are pending in the instant application.

Claims 30-74 are presented for examination.

Claims 75-134 are withdrawn from consideration as being directed to the non-elected subject matter.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 57-62 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for the treatment of macular degeneration, does not reasonably provide enablement for preventing wet form macular degeneration. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims. The factors to be considered whether a disclosure meets the enablement requirements of 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, have been described in *In re Wands*, 8 USPQ2d 1400 (Fed. Cir.1988). Among these factors are:

1) The nature of the invention:

The claims are drawn to a method of preventing the wet form of macular degeneration using a composition of rapamycin dissolved in propylene glycol.

2) The state of the prior art:

The prior art does not recognize that the prevention of macular degeneration is accomplished easily. According to Lance, Current Medical Diagnosis

Art Unit: 1612

and Treatment, 43<sup>rd</sup> edition, pages 159-160, the treatment of macular degeneration is done with photodynamic laser therapy, but repeated treatments are necessary. The above source indicates that there is no specific treatment for atrophic age related macular degeneration.

3) The relative skill of those in the art:

The relative skill of those in the art is high.

4) The predictability or unpredictability of the art:

The unpredictability of pharmaceutical and chemical art is high.

5) The breath of the claims:

The claims are very broad and encompass a composition for preventing wet form macular degeneration.

6) The amount of direction or guidance provided:

Applicant's specification provides guidance for and it is only enabled for the treatment of macular degeneration. In re Dreshfield, 110 F.2d 235, 45 USPQ 36 (CCPA 1940), gives this general rule: "It is well settled that in cases involving chemicals and chemical compounds, which differ radically in their properties it must appear in applicant's specification either by the enumeration of a sufficient number of the members of the group or by other appropriate language, that the chemicals and chemical combinations included in the claims are capable of accomplishing the desired results." Applicant's specification does not set forth any guidance to demonstrate that rapamycin is capable of preventing wet form of macular degeneration.

7) The presence or absence of working examples;

The examples in applicant's specification are drawn to the effect of rapamycin on treating wet form of macular degeneration or inhibiting the formation of wet form macular degeneration from macular degeneration.

8) The quantity of experimentation necessary;

Since compound structure and activity for such pharmaceutical use must be determined from case to case by painstaking experimental study, one of ordinary skill in the art would be burdened with undue experimentation to determine the effect of rapamycin in preventing wet form macular degeneration.

Claims 30-74 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 (b) as being anticipated by Mollison (US 6,015,815) for the reasons set forth on page 2 of the office action of July 6, 2007.

Applicant's arguments and remarks have been carefully considered, but are not deemed to be persuasive. Applicant alleges criticality to the ophthalmic injection in comparison to the topical ophthalmic administration as taught by the prior art. The allegation is not well taken. To deliver a well known ophthalmic composition by injection does not create a patentably distinct composition or use thereof.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to ZOHREH A. FAY whose telephone number is (571)272-0573. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday 9:30-6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Fredrick Krass can be reached on (571) 272-0580. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 1612

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Z.F

/Zohreh A Fay/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1612